

# WILSON ASKS AID OF ALL PARTIES ON DEFENCE TOUR

Requests Towns Where He Is  
to Speak to Bar No  
Partisan.

## APPEAL TO PATRIOTISM KEYNOTE OF SPEECHES

WASHINGTON, Jan. 24.—President Wilson will emphasize the non-partisan character of his national defence programme in the speeches he is to deliver on his speaking tour beginning this week. He will ask support from members of all parties for the measures he has suggested to Congress on the ground that these provide for the least expensive and navy development that can be regarded as adequate to the country's need.

In pursuance of this determination White House officials have already notified the reception committees in the towns where the President is to speak that the gatherings must not be regarded as partisan nor any hindrance placed on the attendance of all citizens, irrespective of their political faith, wherever the President speaks.

The President will reiterate his strong conviction that the United States faces a future whose fortunes cannot now be guessed. The war, he will point out, has wrought many changes not only in the relations between the belligerent countries but in the traditional friendships between these belligerents and neutrals.

He will argue that it behooves the United States to enter on this new era adequately equipped to protect itself against unfriendly designs of other nations and further to see that the common interests of mankind are fully maintained.

### Keynote of the Speeches.

The keynote of the speeches which the President has evolved out of the study he gave to the defence problem during his two days cruise on the yacht Mayflower is this:

That the war has created new conditions the effect of which neither the United States nor any other nation can accurately estimate. That the conditions not only affect the methods and customs of naval warfare, but the fundamental rights of independent governments, as these are recognized in the last several decades.

Not only the United States but every other nation, neutral or belligerent, must be prepared to meet these new conditions. The country must be made ready to face the unexpected, such as a period of hostilities which may be regarded as a proper time for trying out new theories of pacification, international usefulness and disarmament, or a period of hostilities which may be regarded as a proper time for trying out new theories of pacification, international usefulness and disarmament.

In facing new conditions it is the duty of a nation as well as of an individual to be prepared. The inherent strength is capable of its most efficient exertion. It is the duty of the United States to provide itself with the instruments of national defence adequate to its needs and its resources.

Such preparedness, the President will point out, is necessary not only for the maintenance of the rights which the United States has in common with all other neutral nations but especially because of our new and necessary commitment to the Monroe Doctrine. It is, Mr. Wilson believes, for the United States to pledge its adherence to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, to accept the tremendous responsibility involved in the doctrine, without being adequately prepared in both its army and its navy.

### Advice to Pacifists.

The President will point out for the benefit of pacifists that such a policy of preparedness does not by any means involve the development of a spirit of militarism among the people of the country nor a policy of aggression on the part of the Government. It means simply, he will tell the people, that the United States will be placing itself in a position to exert its full strength in the event that such exertion is necessary to the protection of the lives and interests of its citizens.

The speeches delivered by the President up to this time on national defence have not approached the vigor of those he has now outlined. They have been for the most part reserved statements of the policy he would follow in the event that the nation should be called upon to adopt this policy.

His advisers believe that his stumping tour will bring the country to a realization of the importance of the national defence programme.

### "NO TRAILING," SAYS BRYAN.

Will Not Follow Wilson on Stump on Preparedness Issue.

MIAMI, Fla., Jan. 24.—Ex-Secretary W. J. Bryan set at rest today the rumor that he will follow the trail of President Wilson and take the stump across the country. He declared today that he would remain in Miami until the end of February, when he will start for Lincoln, Neb., to attend a birthday dinner on March 20. He will speak at a number of places on the way.

This trip, he declared, had no connection with the President's tour, and the dates he will fill are based upon invitations he has received from the President's friends.

Asked if he would speak on the subject of preparedness, Mr. Bryan replied that wherever he speaks he will follow the line pursued in the last six months.

### PEACE LEAGUE INDORSER.

Feeling of Churches Here Debatable on Amendment.

At the annual meeting of the Federation of Churches in the Metropolitan Life Building yesterday a resolution was adopted endorsing the programme of the League to Enforce Peace. This action was taken after a debate on the need of increased armament in the United States, the affirmative being argued by the Rev. William L. Sullivan, pastor of All Souls' Episcopal Church, and the negative by the Rev. Dr. William P. Merrill, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church and a trustee of the Carnegie Peace Union. About 200 ministers took part in the vote.

Edward Markham read selections from his forthcoming volume, "Poetry of Jesus." At today's session there will be a discussion on "Week Day Religious Instruction in Connection with the Public School System," by Dr. Sullivan, secretary of Mayor Mitchell's committee on unemployment, will talk about unemployment in the city.

# INCOME TAX LAW PHELD; RIGHT TO PAY FOR DEFENCE

United States Supreme Court Declares That Congress  
Did Not Exceed Its Constitutional Powers in the  
Arrangement of the Taxation System.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 24.—The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the income tax law today. The opinion, read by the Chief Justice, covered every legal objection that had been raised against the enactment.

The effect of the opinion on Congress was impressive. Many Senators and Representatives ventured the opinion that the decision giving such sweeping judicial sanction to this form of taxation would increase the popular demand for raising rates on big incomes. It was predicted that the wealth of the country will be called upon to bear the burden of the national defence programme.

With the growing unpopularity of the various forms of taxation suggested by the President to meet the demand for additional revenues leaders in Congress seem to be turning toward the income tax as the least objectionable method of obtaining the needed funds.

### To Increase the Tax.

Representative Hull of Tennessee, author of the income tax provision of the Simmons-Underwood law under review, promptly admitted that they will have the Means Committee would begin at once the consideration of plans for increasing the income tax. The present revenue from the tax on incomes is about \$80,000,000.

The stamp taxes, already under fire by Democrats in Congress led by Speaker Clark, will probably be raised and various suggestions for special excise taxes to meet the demand for more revenue may be cast aside. Instead of these taxes the incomes of the wealthy will be levied upon.

Increases of from one-third to one-half were predicted in the surtaxes on incomes of \$20,000 and upward. The rich will not only be taxed but they will have to pay for the cost of the war.

The exemption of the married man, now \$4,000, will be reduced another \$1,000 at least. The single man, now exempt from taxes on his income up to \$3,000, will pay on all above \$2,000, if the leaders do what they are talking of doing.

If the decision the court has put into operation a new system of taxation that will stand as a revenue producer second only to the customs law.

The tax on incomes was raised by Frank R. Bruenbach, a stockholder of the United Pacific Railroad Company, who sought an injunction to prevent the tax on incomes from being levied on the company. It was an unconstitutional exercise of the taxing power.

The suits in all were brought to test the validity of the act. All of these were decided in favor of the Government in the Federal courts below. Bruenbach's suit was the only one that went to the Supreme District of New York.

It presented only a single phase of the attack on the constitutionality of the income tax. The other suits brought against the act of taxation were brought out by Chief Justice White enumerated these and the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

One of the points raised was that the law was repugnant to the clause in the Constitution which prohibits the Congress from levying a direct tax on the people.

This objection was repelled by the Chief Justice on the authority of the doctrine laid down in the corporation tax case.

On this point the Chief Justice said that it was a common error of those attacking the law to say that it was repugnant to the clause in the Constitution which prohibits the Congress from levying a direct tax on the people.

It was pointed out that the law was not a direct tax on the people but a tax on the income of the individual. The power was a familiar one that had existed since the beginning of the Government and had been sustained by the courts.

The familiar form of attack upon the law, one that was much used while the tariff bill was pending in Congress, was that it was retroactive, because it was passed in October, 1913, and affected incomes accruing after March 1 of that year.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date. Senator Root made strong argument in the Senate to show that the law was unconstitutional because it could not tax incomes accruing before the bill became a law.

That argument started a discussion in Congress as to when the subject matter of the tax bill should be considered as having ceased to be income. As the bill was first drawn it proposed a tax on incomes accruing after January 1 of that year.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date.

Chief Justice White declared that had no standing. Congress had power, the court held, to impose the tax after March 1 of that year, and the law might be retroactive to that date.

live are not compelled to estimate the rental value in making up their incomes while those living in rented houses and who pay rent are not allowed in making up their taxable income to deduct rent.

"Comprehensively surveying all the contentions," said the Chief Justice, "we cannot escape the conclusion that they all rest upon the mistaken theory that, although there be differences between the subjects taxed, to differentiate tax them transcends the limit of taxation and amounts to a want of due process and that where a tax level is believed by one who resists its enforcement to be wanting in wisdom and to operate in justice from that fact in the nature of things there arises a want of due process of law and a resulting authority in the judiciary to exceed its powers and correct what is assumed to be mistaken or unwise exertions by the legislative authority of its lawful powers even although there is no semblance of warrant in the Constitution for so doing."

Summing up the opinion of the court on the various constitutional objections to the tax the Chief Justice said: "So far as these numerous and minute, not to say many respects hypercritical, contentions are based upon an assumed violation of the uniformity clause their want of legal merit is at once apparent, since it is settled that that clause exactly only a geographical uniformity, and there is not a semblance of ground in any of the preparations for assuming that a violation of such uniformity is complained of."

And no change in the situation would arise, even if it be conceded, as we think it must be, that this doctrine is not applicable to the tax on incomes, although there is a seeming exercise of the taxing power, the act complained of was so arbitrary as to constrain to the conclusion that it was an unconstitutional exercise of the taxing power.

The President conferred this afternoon with Representative Flood of Virginia, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs; Representative Page of North Carolina, chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations; Representative Stephens of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs; Representative Lever, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and Senator Hitchcock, chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, who is in charge of the Philippine bill.

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"And over and above all this the fact that its passage would constitute a landmark in the history of the Government is a fact that its passage would constitute a landmark in the history of the Government."

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

The President informed these leaders of the grave necessity which exists for speeding up the work of the Government and a progressive tax was imposed by Congress and that such action was warranted in some, if not all, of the various United States Supreme Court cases that have been decided.

"We have not referred to a contention that because certain administrative powers have been conferred upon the President by the statute upon the Treasury, therefore it was void as an unwarranted delegation of legislative authority, because we think to state the proposition is to answer it."

# WAR ON DEFENCE'S FOES, WILSON ORDER

Alarmed by Opposition, He  
Urges Leaders to Speed Ap-  
propriation Bills.

## ASKS FOR A CLEAR TRACK

WASHINGTON, Jan. 24.—President Wilson summoned to the White House today the chairmen of several House committees which are to report appropriation bills and requested that they adopt emergency methods for hastening the completion of their reports. As a result of this conference it is assumed that the agricultural, Indian and diplomatic and consular appropriation bills will be reported to the House within a few weeks. The District of Columbia appropriation bill, which is in a peculiar status because of certain new legislative proposals under consideration, will not be reported until after a later date.

On the surface the step taken by the President was designed merely to speed up consideration of legislation not relating to national defence in order that an early adjournment of Congress may be possible. As a matter of fact, though, the President's move means the opening of a new chapter in the history of the defence bill, warning of which was given when he announced his intention to take the stump last week.

Particular attention was paid to Articles 1 and 2, which, in the opinion of members of the diplomatic corps, were neutral to the rights of neutral nations and the neutrality of Germany and the violation of the neutrality of Greece by the Institute. Powers, Representatives of the Institute, however, said that the rules had been adopted without reference to developments in the European war, but simply as expressing this principle of justice which should govern the conduct of nations.

That Mr. Lansing himself was misled by the rights of neutral nations and extreme care which he took to disseminate the deliberations of the Institute from any connection with the State Department.

Article 1, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 2, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 3, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 4, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 5, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 6, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 7, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 8, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 9, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 10, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 11, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 12, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 13, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 14, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 15, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 16, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 17, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 18, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 19, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 20, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 21, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 22, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 23, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 24, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 25, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 26, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 27, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 28, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 29, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 30, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 31, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 32, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 33, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 34, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 35, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 36, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 37, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

Article 38, in the declaration of rights, lays down the proposition that every nation has the right to exist and to maintain its independence and to be free from external interference. The right to exist and to be free from external interference is the right to exist and to be free from external interference.

# LANSING DISCLAIMS BILL OF RIGHTS PLAN

This Country Not Officially  
Connected With Scheme to  
Aid Neutrals.

## BUT DIPLOMATS WONDER

WASHINGTON, Jan. 24.—Secretary of State Lansing made it clear today that the United States Government is not to be regarded as in any sense bound by the principles of international law proclaimed last night by the American Institute of International Law as constituting a new "bill of rights" for the agricultural, Indian and diplomatic and consular appropriation bills will be reported to the House within a few weeks. The District of Columbia appropriation bill, which is in a peculiar status because of certain new legislative proposals under consideration, will not be reported until after a later date.

On the surface the step taken by the President was designed merely to speed up consideration of legislation not relating to national defence in order that an early adjournment of Congress may be possible. As a matter of fact, though, the President's move means the opening of a new chapter in the history of the defence bill, warning of which was given when he announced his intention to take the stump last week.

Particular attention was paid to Articles 1 and 2, which, in the opinion of members of the diplomatic corps, were neutral to the rights of neutral nations and the neutrality of Germany and the violation of the neutrality of Greece by the Institute